<div align="center">REMARKS</div>

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated May 14, 2008. Claims 1-2 and 4-5 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-2 and 4-5 are rejected. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended to further define the scope and novelty of the present invention, in view of the Examiner's comments, in order to place the claims in condition for allowance. Support for the amendments to the claims is found throughout the specification, and in particular, on page 8, line 8-12. Claims 6-13 have been added. Support for the amendments to the claims is found throughout the specification, and in particular, in Figures 2 and 3; on page 13, line 3-7 and 16-20; on page 14, lines 4-10; and on page 16, line 8, to page 17, line 14. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been presented. Claims 1-2 and 4-13 remain pending. For the reasons set forth more fully below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are allowable. Consequently, reconsideration, allowance, and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicant's amendments and arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the amendments and arguments to clarify issues upon appeal.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the after-final phone interview of July 15, 2008. We appreciate the courtesy and helpfulness of the Examiner in the interview. The claims have been amended in light of the points made by the Examiner in the interview.

<div align="center">**Rejections 35 U.S.C. §102**</div>

Examiner Stated:

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

**Wagner (U.S. Patent number 5,933,130).** ...

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections. The present invention provides a method for controlling brightness from a display unit. In one embodiment, the method includes calculating a display brightness within a specific first window of a one or more windows displayed on a screen of said display unit. The method further includes controlling said display unit so as to change a screen brightness of the whole screen according to said calculated display brightness within said specific first window. Wagner does not teach or suggest these features, as discussed below.

Wagner discloses an anti-eye-strain apparatus and method which automatically adjusts the brightness of a display to cause the muscles of the eyes of the user to adjust and refocus such that eye fatigue or tiredness is reduced or eliminated. The brightness is varied within a particular range and the brightness within this range is occasionally or periodically adjusted. The changing brightness preferably follows a predetermined pattern or cycle. These brightness changes may be perceptible or imperceptible to the viewer. The brightness of the display may be adjusted electronically or mechanically, for example by a potentiometer, by a computer attached to a monitor by an application or software, or by changing the palette of colors or the gray scale. (Abstract.)

However, Wagner does not teach or suggest the combination of "calculating a display brightness within a specific first window of one or more windows displayed on a screen of said display unit," as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 4. The Examiner has referred to Figures 7 and 8 and column 11, lines 27-30, of Wagner as teaching the calculating step. However, Figure 7 merely shows a brightness control window for controlling brightness, and Figure 8 merely shows a brightness control option

6

in a pull-down menu for controlling brightness. Nowhere does Wagner teach or suggest that the actual brightness within the brightness control window or within the pull-down menu is calculated. In fact, Wagner specifically states that the "user then sets the brightness of the display to the desired general level of brightness." According to the examples of Wagner, the general level of brightness is not set to a percentage (e.g., 50 percent) according to graphical user interface (e.g., column 9, lines 12-16). There is no calculation involved. Wagner merely reads the position of the slide control, which is not the same as calculating the brightness within a window, as in the present invention. Therefore, claims 1 and 4 are allowable over Wagner for at least these reasons.

However, Wagner also does not teach or suggest "controlling said display unit so as to change a screen brightness of the whole screen according to said calculated display brightness within said specific first window," as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 4. The Examiner has referred to Figure 2 of Wagner as teaching the calculating step. However, Figure 2 merely shows a brightness control box 34. As described above, referring to Figures 7 and 8 of Wagner, the brightness of the screen is not set according to a calculated brightness within a specific window, but is instead set by the user moving the position of the slide control to a desired general level of brightness. The Examiner stated that, "the brightness of the whole screen has to be based on the selecting/calculating/adjusting/controlling the brightness of the selected pattern as well." However, referring to Figure 7 and column 9, lines 14-16, of Wagner, the "range, period and pattern are set such that the brightness of the display can be automatically controlled." Referring to Figure 7 of Wagner, nothing describes or suggests that the

brightness of the pattern selection box is calculated. Therefore, claims 1 and 4 are
allowable over Wagner for at least these reasons.

Therefore, Wagner does not teach or suggest the combination of steps as recited
in amended independent claims 1 and 4, and these claims are allowable over Lee.

## Rejections — 35 U.S.C. §103

Examiner Stated:

> **Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
> Wagner (U.S. Patent 6,091,397) in view of Lee (U.S. Patent 6,091,397).**

Dependent claims 2 and 5 depend from independent claims 1 and 4, respectively.
Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to independent claims 1 and 4 apply
with equal force to claims 2 and 5, which are thus allowable over the cited reference for
at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 4.

New dependent claims 6-13

New dependent claims 6-13 have been added to further define the scope and
novelty of the present invention. As noted above, support for the amendments to the
claims is found throughout the specification, and in particular, in Figures 2 and 3; on page
13, line 3-7 and 16-20; on page 14, lines 4-10; and on page 16, line 8, to page 17, line 14.
Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been presented.

Dependent claims 6-13 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 4,
respectively. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to amended
independent claims 1 and 4 apply with equal force to claims 6-13, which are thus
allowable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 4.

8

Furthermore, the features recited in dependent claims 6-13 are not described or suggested in the cited references. Accordingly, claims 6-13 are allowable for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant's attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

July 16, 2008

  /Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Reg. No. 30,801

**Customer Number 54161**
(650) 493-4540
(650) 493-4549